APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,909	03/17/2004	Natasa Milic-Frayling	MS306871.1	4612

27195	7590	10/02/2006

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/802,909	MILIC-FRAYLING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Susan F. Rayyan	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 March 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-29_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-29_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _17 March 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/18/2004_.	6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-29 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on June 18, 2004 was filed

before First Office Action. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37

CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the

examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6,10-13,15-16,20,26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,363,377 issued to Dina Kravets et al

("Kravets") and US Patent Number 6,134,548 issued to Edward Gottsman et al

("Gottsman").

As per independent claim 1, Kravets teaches a system that facilitates search query

results (see Abstract), comprising:

a client-side receiving component that accepts at least one query result from at least

one search service (column 11, line 65, bridging to column 12, line 1 and Figure 1A,

Reference Numbers 18, 30, receiving search results); and

a client-side processing component that provides ... query result information derived

from the query result accepted by the client-side receiving component (column 4, lines

20-21, display results of the search and column 7, lines 49-65, user votes negatively on

a cluster of his informational needs then the system re-clusters the remaining

documents).

Kravets does not explicitly teach user-dependent. Gottsman discloses the claimed

user-dependent (each active user intention is given a Nickname which is the displayed

name the user sees on the screen, column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-14). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Kravets with user-dependent to customize the content to show only the content that

relates to a particular intention (column 35, lines 37-40).

As per claim 2, same as claim augments above and Kravets does not explicitly teach user model. Gottsman discloses the claimed user model (each User Persona has the Persona data model and has many number of active User Intentions. Each active User intention is given a nickname which is the display name the user sees on the screen, see column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kravets with a user model to allow Kravets system to provide the most up-to-date information about an event, drawing from a number of resources to the user to react optimally in a give situation, as suggested by Gottsman (column 39, lines 45-48. Further, user model as taught by Gottsman improves to facilitate web-based comparison shopping in conventional , physical, non-web real environments (column 1, lines 55-57).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches: information related to at least one selected from the group consisting of a user context, a user profile, and a user query result rule (clusters which receive a yes vote are saved along with the query in a search context folder. A user as the ability to find a query and its results by either browsing the search context folders or doing a keyword based search for the among all the context folders, column 7, lines 61-65).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches:

client-side processing component provides the user-dependent query result information

via at least one visual indicator (column 1, lines 14-16, refining and improving search

queries and for organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping

criteria).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches:

the visual indicator comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of

highlighting, color, intensity of color, geometric shape, and quantity of geometric shapes

(column 1, lines 14-16, refining and improving search queries and for organizing the

results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria).

As per claim 6 , same as claim arguments above and Gottsman teaches:

the client-side processing component provides the user-dependent query result

information via at least one aural indicator(column 38,lines 27-41, generate verbal

summary for the user).

As per independent claim 10, Kravets teaches a method for facilitating search

query results (see Abstract),   comprising:

receiving at least one query result from at least one search service(column 11, line 65,

bridging to column 12, line 1 and Figure 1A, Reference Numbers 18, 30, receiving

search results); and

providing ... query result information derived from the query result and

the user-dependent query result information determined via client-side processing.

(column 4, lines 20-21, display results of the search and column 7, lines 49-65, user

votes negatively on a cluster of his informational needs then the system re-clusters the

remaining documents).

Kravets does not explicitly teach user-dependent. Gottsman discloses the

claimed user-dependent (each active user intention is given a Nickname which is the

displayed name the user sees on the screen, column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-14). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Kravets with user-dependent to customize the content to show only the content

that relates to a particular intention (column 35, lines 37-40).

As per claim 11,same as claim arguments above and Kravets does not explicitly teach

user model. Gottsman discloses the claimed user model (each User Persona has the

Persona data model and has many number of active User Intentions. Each active User

intention is given a nickname which is the display name the user sees on the screen,

see column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kravets with a user model to allow Kravets system to provide the

most up-to-date information about an event, drawing from a number of resources to the

user to react optimally in a give situation, as suggested by Gottsman (column 39, lines

45-48. Further, user model as taught by Gottsman improves to facilitate web-based

comparison shopping in conventional , physical, non-web real environments (column 1,

lines 55-57).

As per claim12 same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches:

the user model comprising a model that utilizes, at least in part, information related

to at least one selected from the group consisting of a user context, a user profile, and a

user query result rule(clusters which receive a yes vote are saved along with the query

in a search context folder. A user as the ability to find a query and its results by either

browsing the search context folders or doing a keyword based search for the among all

the context folders, column 7, lines 61-65).

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches:

relaying the user-dependent query result information via at least one search result

page indicator(column 1, lines 14-16, refining and improving search queries and for

organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria).

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Gottsman teaches:

the search result page indicator comprising ... an aural indicator (column 38,lines 27-41,

generate verbal summary for the user).

As per claim 16 same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches;

the visual indicator comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of

symbols, highlighting, color, intensity of color, geometric shape, and quantity of

geometric shapes(column 1, lines 14-16, refining and improving search queries and for

organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria).

As per independent claim 20, Kravets teaches a system that facilitates search query

results(see Abstract):

 means for accepting at least one query result from at least one search service(column

11, line 65, bridging to column 12, line 1 and Figure 1A, Reference Numbers 18, 30,

receiving search results); and

 means for providing ... query result information derived from the query result and the

user-dependent query result information determined via client-side processing (column

4, lines 20-21, display results of the search and column 7, lines 49-65, user votes

negatively on a cluster of his informational needs then the system re-clusters the

remaining documents).

Kravets does not explicitly teach user-dependent. Gottsman discloses the

claimed user-dependent (each active user intention is given a Nickname which is the

displayed name the user sees on the screen, column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-14). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Kravets with user-dependent to customize the content to show only the content

that relates to a particular intention (column 35, lines 37-40).

As per independent claim 26, Kravets teaches:

transmitted between two or more computer components, that facilitates search query

results(column 11, line 65, bridging to column 12, line 1 and Figure 1A, Reference

Numbers 18, 30, receiving search results);

the data packet comprising, at least in part, information relating to a client-side search

query system that utilizes, at least in part, ... information to provide user-dependent

query result data derived from a search service query result. (column 4, lines 20-21,

display results of the search and column 7, lines 49-65, user votes negatively on a

cluster of his informational needs then the system re-clusters the remaining

documents).

Kravets does not explicitly teach user-dependent. Gottsman discloses the claimed

user-dependent (each active user intention is given a Nickname which is the displayed

name the user sees on the screen, column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-14). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Kravets with user-dependent to customize the content to show only the content that

relates to a particular intention (column 35, lines 37-40).

Claims 27-29, are rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1.

Claims 7-9, 14, 17-19,21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,363,377 issued to Dina Kravets et al

("Kravets") and US Patent Number 6,134,548 issued to Edward Gottsman et al

("Gottsman") in view of US Patent Number 6,405,192 issued to Michael Wayne

Brown ("Brown").

As per claim 7 , same as claim arguments above and Kravets and Gottsman do

not explicitly teach the client-side processing component derives the user-dependent

result information via evaluation of at least one link provided by the query result. Brown

does teach this limitation (column 6, lines 24-40 as parse document links and display

change information web page appearance in a user customizable way) to make

informed decisions about which links to follow. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kravets and Gottsman with

the client-side processing component derives the user-dependent result information via

evaluation of at least one link provided by the query result to make informed decisions

about which links to follow (column 2, lines 10-12).

As per claim 8 , same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:

he evaluation of at least one link comprising at determination as to whether the link

corresponds to at least one selected from the group consisting of a document with text

and a document with links (column 6, lines 25-30).

As per claim 9 , same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:

the client-side processing component provides an indication for the link of a percentage

of at least one selected from the group consisting of text within the document and links

within the document (column 9, lines 1-15).

As per claim 14 same as claim arguments above and Kravets and Gottsman do not

explicitly teach displaying, automatically, at least one thumbnail relating to a search

query result page in response to a selection of a corresponding search query result

link by at least one user and navigating to a portion of the search query result page

and turning ON at least one search result page indicator in response to an interaction

with the thumbnail by the user. Brown does teach this limitation (column 2, lines 31-34)

to make informed decisions about which links to follow. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kravets and

Gottsman with displaying, automatically, at least one thumbnail relating to a search

query result page ... to make informed decisions about which links to follow (column

2, lines 10-12).

As per claim 17 same as claim arguments above and same as claim arguments above and Kravets and Gottsman do not explicitly teach deriving at least part of the user-dependent query result information via evaluating at least one link provided by the query result. Brown does teach this limitation (column 6, lines 24-40 as parse document links and display change information web page appearance in a user customizable way) to make informed decisions about which links to follow. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kravets and Gottsman with deriving at least part of the user-dependent query result information via evaluating at least one link provided by the query result to make informed decisions about which links to follow (column 2, lines 10-12).

As per claim 18 same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:
determining whether the link corresponds to at least one selected from the group consisting of a document with text and a document with links(column 6, lines 25-30, column 9, lines 1-15).

As per claim 19 same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:
providing an indicator for the link that indicates at least one selected from the group consisting of a text-content link and a link-content link (column 6, lines 25-30).

As per independent claim 21, Kravets teaches a user interface, comprising:

an interface adapted to communicate enhanced search query results to a user(column

11, line 65, bridging to column 12, line 1 and Figure 1A, Reference Numbers 18, 30,

receiving search results);

at least one input associated with the interface to provide information related to at

least one search query result(column 4, lines 20-21, display results of the search and

column 7, lines 49-65, user votes negatively on a cluster of his informational needs

then the system re-clusters the remaining documents).

Kravets does not explicitly teach user-dependent. Gottsman discloses the claimed

user-dependent (each active user intention is given a Nickname which is the displayed

name the user sees on the screen, column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-14). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Kravets with user-dependent to customize the content to show only the content that

relates to a particular intention (column 35, lines 37-40).

Kravets and Gottsman do not explicitly teach at least one output to indicate ...

search query result information and the output utilizing, at least in part, a thumbnail

view to convey the information. Brown does teach this limitation (see column 9, lines 9 –

column 10, line 11) to make informed decisions about which links to follow. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention n to

modify Kravets and Gottsman with at least one output to indicate ... search query result

information and the output utilizing, at least in part, a thumbnail view to convey the

information to make informed decisions about which links to follow (column 2, lines 10-

12).

As per claim 22, same as claim augments above and Kravets does not explicitly teach

user model. Gottsman discloses the claimed user model (each User Persona has the

Persona data model and has many number of active User Intentions. Each active User

intention is given a nickname which is the display name the user sees on the screen,

see column 35, lines 50-57, Figures 12-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kravets with a user model to allow Kravets system to provide the

most up-to-date information about an event, drawing from a number of resources to the

user to react optimally in a give situation, as suggested by Gottsman (column 39, lines

45-48. Further, user model as taught by Gottsman improves to facilitate web-based

comparison shopping in conventional , physical, non-web real environments (column 1,

lines 55-57).

As per claim 23 same as claim arguments above and Kravets teaches:

the input comprising at least one selection of at least one search query result

(column 7, lines 49-50, vote selection is a selection of a query result).

As per claim 24 same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:

the output comprising an interactive output that responds to a user selection within

the thumbnail view (column 9, line 1- column 10, line 11)

As per claim   25, same as claim arguments above and Brown teaches:

the output comprising at least one indicator of whether a search query result link is

at least one selected from the group consisting of a text-content link and a link-content

link (column 6, lines 25-30).

Contact Information

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Rayyan

September 22, 2006

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100